



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/074,033	02/14/2002	Jonathan B. Sadowsky	219.40024X00	5657
7590 03/29/2004 Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP 12400 Wilshire Boulevard Seventh Floor			EXAMINER	
			TUNG,	TUNG, KEE M
Los Angeles, CA 90025		Я	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2006			2676	1

DATE MAILED: 03/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

. •	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office A -41 Comment	10/074,033	SADOWSKY ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Allen E. Quillen	2676				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	i6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 Ja</u>	nuary 2004.					
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ This	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.					
•	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
 4) Claim(s) 1-4,6-13,15-21,23 and 24 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-4,6-13,15-21,23 and 24 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 						
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s)	_					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/074,033 Page 2

Art Unit: 2676

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 11, 20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Claims 1, 6-8, 11, 15-17 are amended. Claims 5, 14, 22 are cancelled. Claims 1-4, 6-13, 15-21 and 23-24 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 3. Claims 1-4, 6-13, 15-21, 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chin, et al, U.S. Patent 6,608,625, in view of Crook et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0093623.

Page 3

Art Unit: 2676

4. Regarding claim 11, representative of claims 1, 2, 20, 24, Chin discloses a computer graphics system (Figures 1A, 17-21; Column 26, lines 23-24) comprising: a memory to store image data (Column 41, lines 39-44, 60-66; Column 42, line 55 through Column 44, line 45); a bin pointer list (Column 44, lines 35-37) to store information regarding a plurality of image subscenes (Column 3, lines 1-23); and a pointer cache system (Figures 1A, 17, element 108, Column 38, lines 35-47) to maintain data regarding said plurality of image subscenes, wherein said pointer cache system comprises a tag array section and a data array section; [further claim 20] making a data request to a pointer cache system to determine if said pointer cache system contains information relating to said data request; and obtaining information form said pointer cache system (Column 20, lines 1-14; Column 39, lines 40-47; Figure 18, Column 40, lines 13-15).

Chin implicitly discloses wherein said pointer cache system further comprises a decoupling section to create a non-blocking pointer cache system. Crook explicitly teaches wherein said pointer cache system further comprises a decoupling section to create a non-blocking pointer cache system ((See Applicant's Remarks, Page 6, 3rd Paragraph, Instant Application Figure 6) Crook, Figure 5, elements 45, 50; Page 3, Paragraph 42). The motivation for combining a bin pointer cache system with a decoupling FIFO between the Cache Tags and the Cache Data is to improve cache performance (Page 1, Paragraph 8-13). Crook is evidence that at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one skilled in designing 3D graphics machines, to combine the benefits of a bin pointer cache system, as Chin discloses, with a decoupling FIFO to create a non blocking pointer cache system, as Crook teaches, to improve cache performance.

Application/Control Number: 10/074,033

Art Unit: 2676

5. Regarding claim 3, representative of claim 12, Chin discloses a graphics controller of claim 1, wherein each cache tag in said cache tag array section corresponds to at least four pieces of cache data in said cache array section (Figures 13-14, *4 bytes*, Column 27, lines 27-33; Column 29, lines 3-6).

- 6. Regarding claim 4, representative of claim 13, Chin discloses a graphics controller of claim 2, wherein said cache tag array section receives a data request and determines if said cache data array contains information related to said data request (Column 13, lines 15-17, 64-66; Column 20, lines 1-14; Column 27, lines 16-26).
- 7. Regarding claim 6, representative of claim 15, Chin discloses a graphics controller of claim 1, wherein if said cache data array contains information related to said data request then said data request is placed in said decoupling section (Column 30, lines 18-20, 40-55, 66 through Column 31, line 3).
- 8. Regarding claim 7, representative of claims 16 and 21, Chin discloses a graphics controller of claim 1, wherein if said cache data array does not contain information related to said data request then a data request is made for the missing data and the data request is placed in said decoupling section (Column 30, lines 62-66, *refill control*, Figure 18, Column 40, lines 11-18).

Page 4

Art Unit: 2676

9. Regarding claim 8, representative of claims 9, 17-18, 23, Chin discloses a graphics controller of claim 1, wherein said pointer cache system performs a recovery operation following an out of memory condition (Column 40, line 18 through Column 41, line 38).

10. Regarding claim 10, representative of claim 19, Chin discloses a graphics controller of claim 1, wherein said graphic controller vertically arranges said subscenes (Column 49, lines 18-22, 63-67).

Response to Arguments

11. The Applicant asserts that reference Chin discloses a pointer cache system with a decoupling section to create a non-blocking pointer cache system (Page 6, Paragraph 4).

The Examiner respectfully points out, however, that in the amended claims, Chin implicitly discloses these features (Figure 9, Column 30, line 40 through Column 31, line 3). Given the amended claims 1, 11, 20 are now independent claims incorporating this feature, at the Examiner discretion, he has found reference Crook who explicitly discloses giving a clearer presentation of the claimed feature, a decoupling section [FIFO] to create a non-blocking pointer cache system ((See Applicant's Remarks, Page 6, 3rd Paragraph, Instant Application Figure 6) Crook, Figure 5, elements 45, 50; Page 3, Paragraph 42).

Application/Control Number: 10/074,033 Page 6

Art Unit: 2676

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Allen E. Quillen whose telephone number is (703) 605-4584.

The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday – Friday, 8:30am – noon and 1:00 - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew C. Bella, can be reached on (703) 308-6829.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or FAX'd to:

Application/Control Number: 10/074,033

Art Unit: 2676

Page 7

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Sixth Floor (Receptionist), Arlington, Virginia

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number (703) 305-9600 or (703) 305-3800.

Allen E. Quillen Patent Examiner Art Unit 2676

***March 21, 2004

MATTHEW C. BELLA SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Marker (Bella